MISSING PARTS OF SIRAATUL MUSTAQEEM KITAAB

(From Page 117-119)

If one considers carefully then it will be noted that the basis and crux of all Bid`ah is when people leave aside the Qur`aan Majeed, Sunnat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and the perpetual practices of the Ummat from the era of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiallahu anhum), and they waver this way and that way with closed eyes and make all else a part of the Deen. And then to top it all, the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat are (abused and misquoted and) made applicable to these acts. Imaam Sarakhsi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes,
"Indeed a group of people have made these (weak and concocted narrations) a part of the Deen, whereas their actual connection to Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) are dubious and not authenticated, and notwithstanding the fact that they are not definitely attributable (to Nabi - sallallahu alaihi wasallam). And then they misinterpret the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat-e-Mash-hoorah and make these (narrations) applicable. They have thereby made a subordinate (thing) the main and they have made an uncertain and dubious thing a principle and basis. This is how whims and Bid`ahs are born." [Page 367]

In this way the kissing of the thumb has been 'proven' from completely unsubstantiated narrations. By accepting this action and practicing upon it, would necessarily mean that we are falsifying the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiallahu anhum), Tabi`een and the entire Ummat after them. If Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) had advocated his practice and encouraged it, then it would not be possible that the entire group of Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiallahu anhum), Tabi`een and the Ummat after them would not have been practicing thereupon and kissing their thumbs ten times a day. It would also not be possible that this practice did not find any place in any of the Kitaabs of Hadith.

Secondly, that act or practice which in itself is permissible, but there is a possibility of it becoming associated and mixed up with a Bid`ah, or if it will become accepted as a Sunnah, then it would not be permissible to execute such an act.

There are numerous examples in the Ahaadith and Fiqhi Kitaabs to substantiate this principle. Amongst them is the ruling of our Ahnaaf Ulama that it is Makrooh to make a Sajdah-e-Shukr after Salaat. [Fataawa Aalimgiri, page 123, vol.1 / Shaami, page 40. vol.12]

It is stated in *Durrul Mukhtaar, "Sajdah-e-Shukr is Mustahab. This is the accepted ruling. However, its execution after any Salaat is Makrooh, because the ignorant ones will mistake it to be Sunnat or Waajib. Every permissible act which leads to this is Makrooh."*

Allamah Shaami (rahmatullahi alaih) actually goes as far as stating that it is Makrooh-e-Tahrimi, because this is such a thing which is not a part of the Deen and it is being portrayed as such. [*Raddul Mukhtaar*, page 120, vol.2]

Thirdly, if an act which is Mustahab or permissible, but such stress and emphasis is placed thereupon that it gradually becomes regarded as being incumbent, and those

who do not practice thereupon are rebuked and censured, then such an act becomes a sin and Bid`ah.

For example, when Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) completed the Fardh Salaat, most of the time he would turn towards his right side and face the Musallis. Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Abbaas (radhiallahu anhu) would advise the people that they not give shaitaan a share in their Salaat by making it incumbent to turn towards the right upon completion of Salaat. He said that he saw Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) sometimes turn towards the left side as well. [*Mishkaat*, page 85]

(Missing parts from page 221-223)

(In this regard, in the December issue of Tarjumaanul Qur`aan you may have noted that Janaab Ghulaam Ali Saheb has stated in his article that the Ijma` is incorrect.)

↑ ↑

This portion is in the translation. The missing portion goes after this and before the line hereunder. In other words the missing portion goes in between these lines.

↓ ↓

(The request is that you shed some light on this subject.")

(Add this portion between the above stated lines)
"The text of this article appears hereunder:
'The second objection against Moulana Maududi is that he does not regard a fist-length beard as Sunnah, whereas there is consensus of the Ummat upon this. Before answering this, it is essential that one keep in mind the actual text of Moulana Maududi. He has stated in part one of 'Rasaa`il Was Masaa`il',
'With regard to the beard, Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has not stipulated any length thereof. He has merely advised that it be kept. If you keep a beard to oppose the Faasiqeen, and you keep such a beard which according to normal standards would be regarded as a beard, (this would be accomplished by not shaving for a few days) then know that you have fulfilled the command of the Shariah, regardless of whether according to the research of the Fuqahaa it has grown or not.'

One will not have any opportunity to refute the fact that it is not stated in any authentic Hadith, where Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has stipulated a specific length for the beard. The order of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) is general that we should lengthen our beards and shorten moustaches. We this injunction has to be brought into practice, it involves research, and wherever research is involved, there is difference of opinion. According to some, it is Sunnat that the beard be left in its natural state and not trimmed at all. According to others the Sunnat length is a fist-length and Makrooh to keep it longer. Those who aver a fist-length beard are acting in accordance to the practise of Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu), because he would trim off any extra hair over and above his fist size. Actually the authentic view is that he would only do this on the occasion of Hajj and Umrah. There is no clear narration from Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu)

wherefrom it can be ascertained that he regards this a Masnoon length. And if this is a Masnoon length, then is it the minimum or maximum length?
The reality is that if this act of Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu) be regarded as being in accordance to the Sunnat, there is possibility for further interpretation. If this practise was specific to the occasion of hajj or Umrah, then it is obvious that he regarded this as the minimum length and that he would usually keep a longer beard. And if this is accepted as a general practise and his normal habit not to allow the beard to grow longer than a fist-length, then it could be deduced that this was the maximum length that he would keep a beard. If some Fuqahaa opine from this type of interpretation that it is Waajib to trim the beard which is longer than a fist-length, then what Shar`i constraint do they find to prohibit the trimming of less than a fist-length?

Now remains the statement of the author of Durrul Mukhtaar, etc. who aver that there is consensus upon the fist-length beard. None of them have consented to keeping it less than this length. This is such a claim which would be difficult to prove. Leaving aside the other Mathaahib, I will quote here an extract from Allamah Aini's Umdatul Qaari, from the chapter on clothing and the discussion regarding cutting the nails, where he quotes from Imaam Tabri in commenting on the Hadith of 'lengthening the beards', he states, 'It has been established from Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) that the Hadith on lengthening the beards is not general, but specific and to allow it to grow uncontrollably is not permissible and it is Waajib to trim it. However, there is a difference of opinion amongst the Salf regarding the length. Some have said that its length should exceed one fist and it should also be allowed to grow outwards, but not such that it looks unkempt. Others have said that it should be trimmed lengthwise and sidewards, but not excessively. They have not stated any specific size in this regard.'

Thereafter he says,
'However, this, according to me, means that the beard can be trimmed as long as it is still regarded and accepted in society as a beard.'

Now if one views this matter objectively and without any bias, then one will easily notice that there is no real big difference between Moulana Maududi's view and the text of Umdatul Qaari, wherein the one can be refuted and the other consented to." [Tarjumaanul Qur`aan, vol. 59, no. 3, page 183-195]

(Missing portion from pages 242-247)

This missing portion translated hereunder goes just before the under-mentioned Aayat which is in the closing of the Kitaab,

(Allaah Ta`ala says in the Qur`aan Majeed:

"And whoever opposes the Rasool after guidance has been expounded for him and he treads a path other than the path of the Mu`mineen, then We direct him to that path (which he has chosen), and We will fling him into Jahannum, an evil abode.")

It is appropriate that we clarify an extract which was quoted in *Tarjumaanul Qur`aan,* wherein they have given the reference of Allamah Aini (rahmatullahi alaih). It was sad to note that Ghulaam Ali Saheb, has misquoted this text from Aini. This sadness stems from three reasons. Firstly, the manner and way in which this text was presented gives the reader a completely false impression, from what Allamah Aini (rahmatullahi alaih) actually intended, which can be seen when the entire text is viewed in context. Secondly, they have quoted this text as being in support of the view of Moulana Maududi, whereas in actual fact it is not so. And thirdly, they have not interpreted a certain portion of the Arabic text (*'However, this, according to me, means that the beard can be trimmed as long as it is still regarded and accepted in society as a beard.')* properly. This humble writer will now shed more light on these points:

1). Firstly, Ghulaam Ali Saheb has presented the text such that it is actually the words of Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaih) and that Allamah Aini (rahmatullahi alaih) is in agreement to it. This is not at all the case. The preceding text to what he has quoted is as follows, *"And Tabri has stated, 'What is the context of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)'s statement of lengthening the beards? You know that the meaning of 'A`faa' is to lengthen the hairs of the beard. Now if any person wishing to practise on the literal meaning of this will leave his beard to grow uncontrollably and it will become unkempt, thereby becoming a laughing stock for the people. (In order to remove this objection) It has been said that it has been established from Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)…"*

Just see now what the actual context is! In reality Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaih) has presented a question regarding the Hadith on *"Lengthening the beards"*. And that is if a person practises on the literal meaning of the Hadith and allows his beard to grow uncontrollably, then he will become a sight for sore eyes and a laughing stock for others. Now in reply to this, some people have given a reply and this reply is quoted by Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaih) in his statement, *"It has been said…"*
The claim that the statement *"To allow it to grow uncontrollably is not permissible and it is Waajib to trim it"* is neither the statement of Allamah Aini nor that of Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaihima). In fact, this is the statement of some other people and this statement also holds no real credence since it has been stated as *"Qeela (It has been said..)"*, which according to Arabic terminology is attributed to a weak claim. For Ghulaam Ali Saheb to omit the words *"It has been said"* and the question (in the preceding texts of Aini), is inappropriate.
It is also clear from this that the above-mentioned claim is a weak one. It will be a notable thing if the permission for the trimming of the beard be ascertained by citing the weak narration of Hadhrat Amar Bin Shuaib (radhiallahu anhu). There is no question of claiming it to be Waajib. This is the reason why a group of Fuqahaa, amongst whom is Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullahi alaih), do not accept the narration of Amar Bin Shuaib (radhiallahu anhu), and they aver for the generality of *"Lengthening the beards"*. If anyone avers the Wujoob (necessity) of trimming the beard, based on the practise of Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhuma), then this would open another can of worms.

2). By Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaih) stating, *"And others aver…"* he is referring to the view of Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullahi alaih), as has been

ascertained from the text of *Fat-hul Baari*. And there two other things are mentioned, one is that Hadhrat Ataa's (rahmatullahi alaih) view is similar to that of Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullahi alaih), and the second is that Imaam Tabri (rahmatullahi alaih) has preferred the view of Hadhrat Ataa (rahmatullahi alaih). Allamah Aini (rahmatullahi alaih) mentioning of the view of Hadhrat Ataa (rahmatullahi alaih) and that of *"And others aver…"*, denotes no real difference in the two views. Allamah Aini (rahmatullahi alaih) states the view of Hadhrat Ataa (rahmatullahi alaih), as follows, *"And Ataa said that there is no harm in trimming the excess on the length and sides of the beard when it has grown very long, because in it one will become a laughing stock. It has been proven from the Hadith of Umar bin Haroon."*

If anyone asks me on what basis I claim that there is no difference between the two views, then I quote the text of Haafiz Ibn Hajar (rahmatullahi alaih). The reference of Tabri is found in both, *Fat-hul Baari* and *Umdatul Qaari.* Every learned person will be able to see that the reference in *Fath* is complete whereas the one in *Umdah* is incomplete. In *Umdah* there is no mention made of the group who do not aver the ruling of *'Lengthening the beard"* to be specific, whereas Tabri has made mention of this group first. Besides this, there is no mention made in *Umdah* as to which view Tabri opines, whereas this is mentioned in *Fath*. This has been discussed before. As for those who opine that *"And others aver…"* and the view of Ataa are diverse and different, then they should consider as to why such an ambiguous view is stated at all.

3). In the statement of *'However, this, according to me, means that the beard can be trimmed as long as it is still regarded and accepted in society as a beard.'* Ghulaam Ali Saheb should contemplate carefully and understand that the present custom and society are not referred to here. In fact, the society of the prevailing time (i.e. when the Kitaab was written) is referred to here, when the Ulama and Mashaaikh especially and the general masses would keep beards in emulation of the Sunnat of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam). As has already been mentioned citing from the text of Ibn Humaam (rahmatullahi alaih), until the 9th century Hijri, to trim more than a fist-length of the beard was not merely a prevailing custom, it was regarded as impermissible. Therefore, the prevailing custom referred to in *Umdatul Qaari* and that during the era of Moulana Maududi, are worlds apart.

Finally we would like to make Ghulaam Ali Saheb privy of the fact that Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhuma), was a very high ranking Sahaabi and he was also one of the narrators of the *'Lengthening of the beard"* Hadith. This is the reason why according to the principles of Fiqh, the Fuqahaa have stated that owing to his practise, it is permissible to trim the beard over the fist-length and they have stated this to be the minimum length. If the practise was that of any other besides a Companion of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), then in the light of the Sunnat and practice of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and the practice of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiallahu anhum), his action would have been rejected. It is clear in this case that the practise of Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu) be regarded as the minimum Masnoon length. This is also the reason why no Imaam of Fiqh has opined for a length less than a fist. And as has been mentioned earlier, there is a group of Fuqahaa that do not accept the practise of Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu) and they opine for the Hadith of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) to be general. It is now us and you. And now based on what principle would you regard a beard which hangs from the cheeks or one small stubble to be a Masnoon beard. Would one leave aside

the clear proofs and opt for an ambiguous statement of *"As long as it does not resemble the Ahle Shirk"*?

The western culture has so overwhelmed the Muslims of today, that leave alone a beard that covers the throat, it is even difficult to keep a small little beard. Instead of giving encouragement to such people, to aver that this (a small little beard) satisfies and the injunction of the Shariah is totally incorrect. People should make every endeavour to make their practises and lives conform to the Sunnat of Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam).

▪▪